

Dear Phil,

1/15/85

When your 12/6/84, largely "ay, came, I think I wrote and said it would have to wait until I got caught up. Well, I'm not caught up, except in what has become an annual bronchial infection this time of the year. But I did work my way down to this envelope in looking for something else, and I'm embarrassed that it has taken me this long.

The decision in my field offices case was such a moral, ethical, legal and judicial monstrosity that I felt I had to file a petition for an en banc review, even though pro se. Conflict of interest with Jim, created by DJ and fink district court judge, so "ader's people represented Jim and the ACLU me, but for the filing of the appeals briefs only. In fact, I've not had a word from any lawyer since the decision was handed down 12/7. I got it filed and when able have been making efforts to do something with it that could have some meaning. But as it is getting toward supertime I'll let that wait and pick up with this envelope.

Your piece in Critique on the so-called mysterious deaths, Penn's word and not justified, suffers from Pennitis. What you call the class of 1977 does not consist of people who had personal knowledge of the assassination. Sullivan had knowledge of the FBI's attitude and some of its "investigation," but his death is unfortunately typical of the hunting season and not, safe for loose writing and wild imaginings by others, suspect. DeMohrenschildt was quite literally insane and subject to pressures he could not handle, after much bad treatment from the Oltmanns of the world, and there is no reason not to believe he killed himself. Pawley is no more relevant than you are. I can go on and on like this. In this kind of writing you undermine your own credibility. On this let me skip to what caught my eye, 218, "Ferrie was a contract agent for the CIA and an aide to Carlos Marcello." I've heard it said that F was a CIA contract agent but I've seen no proof. And Ferrie was not an aide to Marcello. He was connected with one of "arcello's many lawyers, G. Wray Gill and Gill recommended to Marcello's immigration lawyer, in Washington, the late Jack Wasserman, hiring Ferrie as an investigator.

What "many say" is not a legit source, especially considering who the "manys" see among the wild conspiracy theorists.

Go Penn's wild and irresponsible way and the way you are headed in this article and can you exempt or exculpate anyone? Get your feet on the ground and your head out of the ~~fog~~ fogs or you'll ruin your rep among thinking people who do not begin with prejudices, esp. those you work with.

Ray's suit against the Archives is insane, based on his or "ark "ane's thought planted with him that the FBI killed King, which is not within possibility. So he has the silly notion that the recordings of the King intercepts will help him prove it. I tried to talk him out of it but he holds to that crazy notion that he has to know simply isn't rational. His interrogatories are largely incompetent, addressed to the wrong defendant.

I'm not even taking time to reread the papers, the first of which is the Hnatman to Heymann of 8/25/78. Those papers were disclosed to me years ago and HSCA could not have been more wrong-headed or utterly irresponsible. They ultimately declined to prosecute as "bootstrapping," whether or not it is in these sheets.

Ray's 12/3/84 to you begins with the insanity about the Alton bank job and is substantially correct. For a hasty and still untested analysis of the HSCA's b.s. on John and the bank jobs see what I filed and is in their Volume 8. They never did produce the raw material they were to have produced and managed to misaddress pretty much all of what they did mail. Prepared under great handicaps and had to be rushed. Filed at last session the committee held.

My recollection of phone numbers no longer clear but independently we, Jim and

I, got the leads to Thompson from an incomplete phone number in Arthur Hanes' notes, as I now recall. Ray was totally uncooperative with me on this aspect, and that alone raises substantial questions when I was his investigator, You did not enclose what he got from Webberman so I know nothing about that. He has changed his story about Rosenman. He claimed originally that it was on the back side of the business card of a federal outfit that didn't exist at that time. Again, he kept this from me. In different form, with Rosen^{son} the assassin, they used it in what I used to refer to as the Christmas Massacre, meaning of themselves. Jimmy and Jerry.

I think I told you about the DeSoto, your #2 and if I didn't respond to #3, the police within 4 miles of the Lorraine were to file statements including where they were. These did exist, might be somewhere in Tenn and may have been given to FBI but he has strange notions and they can't help Ray.

Your #4 is consistent with my experience and I don't know why he won't open up on Raoul, except that maybe he thinks he'd get killed if he did. He used to prate omerta to me, not going to do the FBI's work for it. He might believe it but it is not that at all so it makes little sense.

#5, I have no knowledge of his conditions after early 1976, last time I saw him. But you can be sure the state doesn't want him knocked off.

#7 He never was much interested in Jim's Grill with me, either, save to tell me, as I recall, that he met Raoul and another there.

I'm glad you had a chance to make your own evaluation. As you can see, giving a meaningful description of such people to those who've never met them and never had experience with such types is impossible and ordinarily would not be believed. Jim and I broke our humps trying to help him and he wasted our time, doing nothing of significance to help his defense and much to obstruct it. He insisted upon making a bad appearance in court, for example, perhaps his expression of personal independence but not very sensible. He did not want to wear a tie, for example. I'm absolutely certain he hasn't levelled with me on some things and some things he did are not rationally explained by his explanations. Like going back to Atlanta just to pick his laundry up, and then going to Canada, delaying escape that long and increasing the possibility of getting caught that much. I've got a notion or two along this line and want to keep this to myself until I have time to develop. By now you know how far out some of their ideas are, but can you imagine driving to Atlanta just to get clothes that were not worth much more than the cost of the trip?

I'm also certain that he knew more about New Orleans than he indicated to me, but what and how I do not know.

He'll never get anything useful under FOIA the way he is going and if the FBI has anything it regards as useful to him it will have it where it can fail to find it under FOIA searches. What you have to understand is that it never investigated the crime itself. Some day I'll recall where I have a duplicate copy of its defense against some charges, that all it ever conducted was a UFAC case, unauthorized flight to avoid confinement. That is partially true. The rest of the ~~truth~~ truth is that with Ray a bird in hand, it was not going to beat the bushes. Except for the irrelevant and immaterial, which it used to inflate statistics and then use those phony statistics to represent the magnitude of its investigation. How could it avoid leaving records that could hurt it? I am certain it was at the DeSoto and did interview those two maids. But there is no record of that in MURKIN. Why? Because it could indicate that Ray met someone there and that could mean conspiracy. which the FBI could not do much about even if it wanted to.

Please excuse the haste, but I wanted to get around to replying and I've much on which I'm far behind. Best wishes,

Harold